

Attorney Docket No. PALM-3689
Application No.: 09/940,321
Reply to Office Action filed August 31, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-19, and 21-23 are pending in the application. By this Reply, claims 1, 9, and 19 are amended for consistency with the specification and to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action dated August 31, 2005, claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-19, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner alleges the following:

The scope of the invention is difficult to ascertain because it is unclear exactly what comprises the display time zone. In particular, is the display time zone related to the current time zone or some other zone? Furthermore, it is unclear if the display time zone is related to the message that a time zone change has occurred? [sic]

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegations and submit that the claim language is not indefinite. As discussed throughout the disclosure, for example, at page 10, line 5 through page 11, line 21, the display time zone can be any desired time zone selected by a user. For example, the display time zone can be the local time zone where the user is located, a home time zone where the user primarily resides, an arbitrary time zone selected by the user, or a default time zone, which may be any of the above. This disclosure supports the claimed feature of "establishing a display time zone wherein said display time zone is user customizable and independent of events associated with [a] calendar application."

In addition, in one exemplary embodiment of the disclosure consistent with the pending claims, the display time zone can be established semi-automatically by the palmtop computer receiving a message indicating that a time zone change has occurred, and receiving an input from a user confirming a change in time zone. As

Attorney Docket No. PALM-3689
Application No.: 09/940,321
Reply to Office Action filed August 31, 2005

discussed in the specification at, for example, page 11, lines 15-12, the user is prompted when a potential time zone change is detected by the palmtop computer. The user may then confirm the time zone change to alter the display time zone or reject the time zone change and keep the display time zone unchanged.

Applicants therefore submit that the pending claims are clear and definite and request that the § 112 rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent No. 5,845,257 to Fu et al. (Fu). In addition, claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fu in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0116541 to Parker et al. (Parker), and claims 15, 17, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,402 to Devine et al. (Devine). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding independent claim 9, Fu does not disclose or suggest a handheld computer having time zone information management including, *inter alia*, a calendar application operating to "establish a display time zone by receiving a message indicating that a time zone change may have occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zones." To the contrary, Fu discloses a personal information manager (PIM) that can automatically set its local time to a new time zone via conventional broadcasted reference signals (e.g., PBS time signals, global positioning satellite signals, or the like). Col. 5, lines 28-33; col. 19, lines 51-54. Fu also discloses that the local time of the PIM can be changed manually (e.g., by manually changing the time zone, or by changing the system clock to the new local

Attorney Docket No. PALM-3689
Application No.: 09/940,321
Reply to Office Action filed August 31, 2005

time). Col. 11, lines 33-36; col. 19, lines 49-51. However, Fu does not disclose or suggest establishing the display time zone of the PIM by receiving a message indicating a possible time zone change and an input from a user confirming the change, as recited in claim 9.

In the Office Action, referring to column 5, lines 28-40, the Examiner alleges that Fu teaches a “process whereby a user is able to change the local time when a user arrives in a different time zone.” Regardless of the accuracy of the Examiner’s allegation, such a teaching in no way anticipates independent claim 9. As discussed above, Fu may disclose automatic and manual changing of the PIM’s time zone independent of one another, but Fu does not disclose or suggest establishing the display time zone of the PIM by receiving a message indicating a possible time zone change and an input from a user confirming the change, as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, the § 102(b) rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

For reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 9, Fu also fails to disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 19. For example, claim 19 recites a handheld computer having time zone information management including, *inter alia*, a calendar application operating to “establish a display time zone by receiving a message indicating that a time zone change may have occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zones.” As discussed above, Fu does not disclose or suggest these features. Accordingly, the § 102(b) rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

For reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claims 9 and 19, Fu also fails to disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. For example,

Attorney Docket No. PALM-3689
Application No.: 09/940,321
Reply to Office Action filed August 31, 2005

claim 19 recites a method of management of time zone information in a calendar application, *inter alia*, establishing a display time zone "by receiving a message indicating that a time zone change may have occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zones." As discussed above, Fu does not disclose or suggest these features.

Neither Parker nor Devine overcomes the above-noted deficiencies of Fu, nor are they relied upon for such teachings. Instead, Parker is relied upon for the alleged teaching of a calendar application with an event having an end time, and Devine for the alleged teaching of a display time zone interface element forming part of a user interface and comprising a display time zone menu. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13-18, and 21-23 depend from either claim 1, claim 9, or claim 19 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that respective claim 1, 8, or 19 is allowable, as well as for their own unique features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of claims 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13-18, and 21-23 and timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art, with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conversation might advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at 410-414-3056.

Attorney Docket No. PALM-3689
Application No.: 09/940,321
Reply to Office Action filed August 31, 2005

If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-3102.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 3, 2006
Correspondence Address: 49637

By: Thomas M. Isaacson/
Thomas M. Isaacson
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410 - 414-3056